UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTHERN DIVISION

W	Ш	$\mathbf{L}\mathbf{I}$	Α	M	Н	MA	T	Γ H	FW	7S
	, 11		L 1	T V T	11.	1717 3	ч.		┸╵	υ.

D 1		
וט	lain	t1++
-	14111	
	will	~

v.

Case No. 2:10-cv-145 HON. R. ALLAN EDGAR

GREGG MCQUIGGIN, JOHN BOYNTON, PAUL HOOTEN, and MELODY CHAPIN,

j	Defendants.	
		/

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff William H. Matthews, a Michigan state prisoner in the custody of the Michigan Department of Corrections, brings this federal civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against defendants Greg McQuiggin, John Boynton, Paul Hooten, and Melody Chapin. On September 28, 2010, the Court dismissed the plaintiff's claims against defendants Greg McQuiggin and John Boynton. [Court Doc. No. 7].

Defendant Paul Hooten moves for summary judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. [Court Doc. No. 11]. On August 29, 2011, Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley submitted his report and recommendation. [Court Doc. No. 37]. The Magistrate Judge recommends that defendant Hooten's the motion for summary judgment be granted. Because the plaintiff's claims against defendant Melody Chapin are the same as the plaintiff's claims against defendant Paul Hooten, it is further recommended that summary judgment be granted *sua sponte* in favor of defendant Melody Chapin. In sum, it is recommended that this civil action be dismissed in its entirety.

The parties have not timely filed any objections to the report and recommendation. After

reviewing the record, the Court ACCEPTS and ADOPTS the report and recommendation pursuant

to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), and W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). The motion by

defendant Paul Hooten for summary judgment [Court Doc. No.11] is **GRANTED**. Summary

iudgment is **GRANTED** sua sponte in favor of defendant Melody Chapin. The plaintiff's entire

complaint shall be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as to all claims against all defendants.

For the reasons expressed in the report and recommendation, the Court finds that any appeal

by plaintiff Matthews from the decision and judgment in this case would be frivolous and not taken

in good faith. McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F. 3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 1915(a)(3) and Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(4)(B), the Court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal by plaintiff

Matthews from the judgment of this District Court would not be taken in good faith.

In the event that plaintiff Matthews takes an appeal to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, this

Court shall assess and require him to pay the \$455 appellate filing fee pursuant to § 1915(b)(1), see

McGore, 114 F.3d at 610-11, unless he is barred from proceeding in forma pauperis by the "three

strikes" rule in 28 U.S.C. 1915(g). If the plaintiff is barred by the "three strikes" rule in 28 U.S.C.

1915(g), then he shall be required to pay the \$455 appellate filing fee in one lump sum.

A separate judgment will be entered.

SO ORDERED

Dated: September 20, 2011.

/s/ R. Allan Edgar

R. ALLAN EDGAR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2